EXHIBIT "B" Deposition of Maurice Kraut

COPY

In the Matter Of:

VAGISH vs. SENECA SPECIALTY

3:13-CV-03161-TLW

MAURICE R. KRAUT

September 11, 2015



- 1 Q. Okay.
- 2 A. I didn't develop any of those names on
- 3 -- I -- I'm not sure what your
- 4 question is, but if your question is
- 5 did I develop any of those on my own,
- 6 no, I got those from the material.
- 7 Q. Sure. That was my question was if you
- 8 recall what materials you obtained them
- 9 from.
- 10 A. Right. And that's what I was
- answering. From -- from the --
- 12 | Q. From the material.
- 13 \mid A. -- production in the file.
- 14 Q. Okay. And then numbers 24 to 28, those
- were residents at the hotel at the time
- of the fire; is that correct?
- 17 | A. Correct.
- 18 | Q. And do you know if Seneca was provided
- 19 with that list before the suit was
- 20 | filed?

25

- 21 A. No, but that should have been -- the
- 22 initial investigation by Seneca should
- have been, do you know of any witnesses
- and can you provide their names.
 - Q. Do you know if the insured contacted



	1	
1		exhibits attached to the EUO. And I
2		think those are sufficient to for
3		Vagish to support their loss. Then
4		it's up then it's up to Seneca to
5		prove or disprove what what Vagish
6		is claiming.
7	Q.	Are you aware that at the Examination
8		Under Oath a number of documents were
9		requested that the insured provided
10		after the examination concluded?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	And do you know what those documents
13		related to?
14	Α.	I don't have it in front of me, but,
15		no, I don't.
16	Q.	Okay. Do you know if those documents
17		were provided by Vagish to Seneca
18		before suit was filed?
19	Α.	I don't, but I believe that Seneca was
20		given unfettered access to Vagish's
21		accountant. And so any question that
22		Kislaya couldn't answer, should have
23		been able to be answered by his
24		accountant.



25

Q.

Okay. And I was talking about

	VAGIS	SH VS. SENECA SPECIALTY
1		documents though. Are you aware that
2		there was a document request made after
3		the Examination Under Oath?
4	Α.	Correct.
5	Q.	Are you aware that those documents were
6		provided before suit was filed?
7	A.	I don't know.
8	Q.	Okay. Would that be important to your
9		analysis?
10	Α.	It it could be, but my review of the
11		documents that were supplied, in other
12		cases I've handled that was sufficient
13		for me to do my investigation as to
14		whether or not those documents supplied
15		were accurate.
16	Q.	Okay. And you just told me that you
17		don't know why the documents were
18		requested in this case; right? You
19		don't know that the documents they
20		the documents requested, they went to
21		establishing the amount of the loss, or
22		the motive to commit the loss?
23	Α.	Correct.
24	Ο.	You don't know what the documents went

25

You don't know what the documents went to --



1 A. Correct.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- $2 \mid Q. -- right?$
- A. Seneca should have sat down with Kislaya and worked out their differences.
 - Q. Okay. Page nine, top of the page.

 "Seneca refused to assist the insured with the submission of the proof of loss." Do carriers assist their insured's in completing a proof of loss when there's a question of liability, or a question of coverage?
 - A. Generally, no, they resolve the question of coverage. But once the question of coverage is resolved, they do assist the insured with the proof of loss.
 - Q. Okay. In this case when the proof of loss was completed was there still a question of coverage?
 - A. Yes. And in Seneca's mind apparently there's still a question of coverage.
- Q. So you just told me then that if
 there's a question of coverage an
 insured does not assist in completing

